

Watergate Hearings: James McCord, Jr (May 18 & 22 1973)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw> (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw>)

Uploaded by [Our Hidden History \(https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCbfzsfzfxZr4qmeZjZ_3R_Pw\)](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCbfzsfzfxZr4qmeZjZ_3R_Pw) on Tue Dec 12 2017.

Full hearings (McCord's testimony starts at page 125) <https://archive.org/details/presidentialcamp01unit>

James Walter McCord Jr. (born June 26, 1924) is a former CIA officer, later involved, as an electronics expert, in the burglaries which precipitated the Watergate scandal.

McCord was born in Waurika, Oklahoma and briefly attended Baylor University before receiving a B.B.A. from the University of Texas at Austin in 1949. In 1965, he received an M.S. in international affairs from George Washington University. After beginning his career at the Federal Bureau of Investigation, McCord worked for the Central Intelligence Agency, ultimately ascending to a GS-15 position in the Agency's Office of Security. For a period of time, he was in charge of physical security at the Agency's Langley headquarters; according to Russ Baker, then-Director of Central Intelligence Allen Dulles once introduced McCord to an Air Force colonel as "the best man we have". In 1961, and under his direction, a counter-intelligence program was launched against the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. He also held the rank of lieutenant colonel in the United States Air Force Reserve.

Shortly after resigning from the CIA, McCord was interviewed and then hired by Jack Caulfield in January 1972 "for strict, solely defensive security work at the Republican National Committee and the Committee to Re-Elect the President (CReeP)". He and four other accomplices were arrested during the second break-in to the Democratic National Committee's headquarters at the Watergate complex on June 17, 1972. The arrests led to the Watergate scandal and resignation of President Nixon. McCord was one of the first men convicted in the Watergate criminal trial; on eight counts of conspiracy, burglary and wiretapping. In a later letter, written to U.S. District Judge John Sirica, McCord stated that his plea and testimony, some of which he claimed was perjured, were compelled by pressure from White House counsel John Dean and former Attorney General John N. Mitchell. The letter implicated senior individuals in the Richard Nixon administration of covering up the conspiracy that led to the burglary.

For more related content, please visit: <https://archive.org/details/@altviewstv-fanclub>

[00:00:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw)

in the Senate of the United States a resolution to establish a Select Committee of the Senate to conduct an investigation and study of the extent if any to which illegal improper or unethical activities were engaged in by any persons acting individually or in combination with others in the presidential election of 1972 or any campaign canvass or other activity related to it over again shuffler adds more detail on how the Watergate burglars were arrested then one of them McCord said he took part only because he was told the operation was approved by the then Attorney General John Mitchell in the second hour McCord testifies that he Howard hunt and John Caulfield pressured him to stay silent after his arrest he said the offers included cash for bail executive clemency and aid for his family he said the offers were made in the name of the White House under questioning in the third hour McCord said that G gordon liddy told him that John Mitchell liked what the telephone taps were producing and wanted a broken one fixed and later in the hearing in the fourth

hour McCord said that the committee to re-elect the president got intelligence reports from the Justice Department almost on a daily basis he said assistant attorney general Robert Mardian helped him get things now let's go to the hearings which Senator Sam Ervin gaveled open

[00:02:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=120s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=120s)

Ervin gaveled open I think Jonathan Cole next with Mr. James McCord use well gentlemen you should give to the sister Senate Select Committee on presidential campaign activities shall be the truth the whole truth and nothing but the truth so help you God Mr. McCord would you bring the microphone closer to you so that we can all hear I know your voices now for the record would you burst state your name and address JW FCC ID number seven Wender w IM in the ER wonder court now I am accompanied with counsel this morning I will counsel please identify himself yes my name is Vernon Pence to our junior business address is man 1016 Street Northwest Washington DC Mr. McCord prior to your testimony you have any preliminary statement you may wish to make to the committee yes there is I would like to state as I did when I've heard that the executive session of this committee I'd like to be as accurate as I can at some of the dates that I will refer to they're approximately seventy-five to a hundred different dates I will try to recall to the best of my memory some may be inaccurate as I stated when I first appeared some matters go back some 12 to 14 months and some of the matters that our vendors

[00:04:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=240s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=240s)

some of the matters that our vendors this committee therefore set forth in writing attempting to reconstruct my memory for the best of my ability I may refer to some of those memorandum during this meeting and two other notes that pertain to dates and I hope you will bear with me and understand the reason reason in that regard state finally that my participation in the Watergate operation on my part for whatever reasons I may have had at the time whatever is now on the event at the time it wasn't there was a mistake and a very grave mistake which I regret now is a fact now Mr. McCord that you presently stand convicted on a multi count federal indictment charging burglary electronic surveillance and conspiracy arising out of the break-in of the Democratic National Committee headquarters the Watergate strike and are you now awaiting sentence on that conviction that is correct what is your professional background Mr. McCord I was born in 1924 and more like Wau Rik Waurika Oklahoma I worked first for the Federal Bureau of Investigation in 1942 1943 in Washington DC in New York City and radio intelligence duties subsequently in 43 to 45 there's an Air Force with an Army Air Corps officer from 1948 to 1951 I worked as a special agent for the Federal Bureau of Investigation in San Diego in San Francisco California I worked from 1951 to 1971 Trull Intelligence Agency as a security officer I retired from that agency in August 1970 after 25 years Federal service you want the educational

[00:06:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=361s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=361s)

service you want the educational background no sufficient Mr. McCord during your service with the CIA or the FBI did you receive any awards or commendations for your service I received on retirement in August 1970 the Distinguished Service Award for outstanding performance of duty with CIA and I'll see you sir mother now prior to your arrest indictment and conviction relating to the Watergate incident well you ever arrested charged with the crime or the subject of any complaint or disciplinary proceeding in your life I've had traffic violations in the Washington area is that all now were you an employee of the committee to re-elect the president I was what position did you hold what community I came aboard first security consultant part-time in September 1971 by the way how did you get that job I was introduced initially by Mr. John Caulfield to Mr. Robert Odle the director of administration who testified yesterday and based on that interview was acquired part-time and then full time and January the 1st of January 1972 now what were your duties in that position as security MP the duties were essentially the function of the protection of the property and the lives of the personnel committee in their facility there and subsequently in the facility at Miami Florida that the committee and some of the White House staff were to occupy during the Republican National Convention in August of 1972 the duties were primarily those

[00:08:02 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=482s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=482s)

of 1972 the duties were primarily those of physical security protection of personnel security some doctor document security and some protected people work for the family of John Mitchell now for those duties and that assignment that you just described under whose direction did you work primarily under the direction of mr. Robert Otto who was my immediate supervisor in the committee the responsibilities with mr. Mitchell and his family received directions from him from the Mitchell from Robert Odle from Fred will rule at various times now did there come a time when you work under the direction of Gordon Liddy yes sir good what was mr. Liddy's position at that time he was at first from December until about March 1970 December 71 to about March 1972 General Counsel are they committed to reelect the president thereafter he was occupied the same position with the Finance Committee for the election of the president when when did this arrangement or which you work under his direction begin mr. Liddy the first discussions of the arrangement again sometime in January 1972 early January could you briefly state the committee mr. Ford what it was I could give a bit of a background if you want that when he first came aboard the committee in December 1971 he began to we struck up in the clan ups we'd had a common background and he began to question me

[00:10:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=600s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=600s)

background and he began to question me regarding the state of the art of certain technical devices for one thing listening devices and so on this appeared to be at that point in time a professional interest a normal professional interest of someone who's worked in the field or law enforcement we discussed as well the common topic of common interest to he and to me and to others who were senior in the staff of the anticipated demonstrations and possible violence that might be coming up in San Diego California which was originally scheduled to be the convention site for the Republican convention in 1972 in August the discussions the discussions on other matters I believe it might help the panel operator might give us some advice in this respect I think in the mid horse if we could turn up the volume would you continue it yes gradually the discussion in December January February in 1972 with mr. Liddy gradually developed into more and more conversation on his part with me in the offices of the committee for the election of president regarding the technical devices and political matters pertaining to the forthcoming convention and it became apparent that he had an interest in several areas of intelligence gathering pertaining to the

[00:12:02 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=722s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=722s)

intelligence gathering pertaining to the Democratic Party and the Democratic convention and in which it was contemplated by planned by him and by others who we refer to these conversations as John Mitchell John Dean the counsel for the president Jeb Magruder then in January the interim director are they committed to real life lesson which it appeared that those men the four of them were in the by late January a planning stage in which political intelligence was to be discussed at meetings in the attorney general's office mr. Mitchell's office and in which mr. McDonough mr. Liddy was seeking from these certain information regarding the costs and the types of electronic devices that could be used in bugging that a part of the budget proposal which he was working working on a second part dealt with photography operations plans estin photography operations the third part dealt with the broad area of political espionage what intelligence report when you speak of political activities political intelligence bugging activities what do you mean in terms of how that was to be obtained your knowledge of what he told you area of political espionage and he telling us he did not that can set that one aside

[00:14:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=840s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=840s)

he did not that can set that one aside pretty quickly he did not elaborate on in much detail at all to me personally apparently others were involved with him which I can refer to later in the conversation specifically mr. Hunt he Howard on the topic of photography clandestine photography in which he was preparing the budget and preparing to meet with the gentlemen I referred to before in planning sessions dealt with photographic equipment and that cost the photographic equipment and specific items of equipment that would be used against the Democratic Party the Democratic hierarchy in Washington primarily but also in

Miami Florida the electronic devices which he referred to specifically were of a variety of types what the pipes were but how we're wood how are they going to be used where were they replaced from your understanding the initial initial interests specified by mr. liddy in this regard were number one against mr. Larry O'Brien and chairman of the Democratic National Committee in Washington DC at his residence and subsequently at his office in the Watergate office building perhaps other offices of the Democratic National Committee McGovern headquarters in Washington DC were mentioned quite early in 1972 and there was some general

[00:16:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=960s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=960s)

in 1972 and there was some general reference to the Democratic National Convention facility or site where that might be located at their convention in the summer of 1972 I know this report and connection with this assignment in which you were having these discussion of the mobility did you come to associate yourself with mr. e Howard hunt Bernard Barker Eugene Martinez Frank Sturgis and Virgil Gonzalez yesterday and as a result of that association and your agreement with mr. Liddy did you with mr. Barker Sturgess Martinez and Gonzales illegally entered the Democratic National Committee headquarters on two occasions one one or about May 30 1972 and the other in the early morning hours of June 17 1972 on the first occasion on or about May 30 1972 did you install two telephone interception devices or wiretaps on two office telephones one on the telephone is Spencer Oliver and the other on the telephone of Lawrence O'Brien leaving aside for the time being why you broke into the Democratic National Committee headquarters to order gate the second time on June 17 and what circumstances led to your arrest you were in fact arrested by plainclothes and the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police shortly after you entered is that true that's correct and if that arrest has led to your present conviction do you tell the committee mr. McCourt why after a lifetime of work as the law enforcement without success defied any blemish on your career did you agree with mr. liddy to engage in his program of burglaries and illegal wiretapping and specifically the two break-ins on May 30 and June

[00:18:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=1081s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=1081s)

the two break-ins on May 30 and June 17th the Democratic National Committee headquarters before gate if there were a number of reasons associated with the ultimate decision of mine to do so one of the reasons and a very important reason to me was the fact that the Attorney General himself mr. John Mitchell at his offices had considered and the food the operation according to mr. Liddy secondly that the counsel for the president mr. John Dean had participated in those decisions with him that one was a top legal officer for the United States and the Department of Justice and the second gentleman was a top legal officer in the White House that the matter had apparently been given well just for a second I noticed you say mr. Mitchell had approved according to Liddy do you have personal knowledge of mr. Dean's participation or this or this also according to mr. live mr. Dean's participation came to me through two sources one was mr. Liddy one was Mr Hunt D Howard hunt in discussions which subsequently came to me to compromise your testimony work try to adhere strictly to the rules of a court of law but it would be helpful

[00:20:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=1200s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=1200s)

a court of law but it would be helpful to million I believe maybe if in each instance and information you give us it's not at their own personal first-hand knowledge you would identify that site and give us a sword yes sir I believe I was responding to a question of the council that what was not what were my reasons which involved in my case a conclusion and motivation and intent as opposed to what someone else at your testimony is to the effect you assured by mr. mr. ladies opera most operations and you also received the shorts not on the info that was based on what you were told by mr. liddy and mr. Hart that is correct sir maybe I would say that though upon the rules of evidence this at present stage of this Herrin would not be admissible to show the connection any connection of this model by John Mitchell John Dean Dino but testimony which mr. McCord is given is relevant to show the motorists which prompted mr. McCord to participate in the matter yes I'll explain I am NOT a lawyer I'm a layman I will try to give the information of my

knowledge for this firsthand or secondhand to the benefit of this committee and you can stop me at what point you may feel that spark elusive mr. chairman if I might just elaborate that point I thoroughly agree with the statement made with the Chairman I associate myself with him as to its content and formal and I once again I'm not trying to impede the progress your testimony it would be very helpful to us however if when

[00:22:02 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=1322s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=1322s)

helpful to us however if when information is not first-hand information you would identified so we can simply note it for our records that effect thank you now would you proceed certainly glad to some time in July 1972 shortly after I got out of jail which was in June 1972 about midday there was a note in my mailbox at my residence and when I opened the letter which had not been stamped and our sent through the mails it was a note from Jack Caulfield Science Act which said go to the phone booth on route 355 near your home and he gave three alternate times at which I could appear at the phone booth for a telephone call of him to the best of my recollection one of those times was very shortly thereafter an hour too later and another time was the next day and it seems to me that the third time was the following evening I went to the telephone to that telephone booth on route 355 that afternoon the same afternoon as I best recall and I heard the voice that I have referred to in this memorandum off today I do not know the individuals identity he had an accent that I would refer to as a New York accent he said that he had formerly

[00:24:03 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=1443s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=1443s)

accent he said that he had formerly worked with Jack Caulfield he said that I'm a friend of Jack's I formerly worked with him Jack will want to talk with you shortly he will be in touch with you soon I received a call subsequently from mr. Caulfield to the best of my recollection it came to my home first and it said go to the same phone booth on route 355 which I did and there mr. Caulfield told me that he was going overseas in a few days he said if you have any problems if you have any problems call my home and leave word and I will call you back from overseas to your residence he said when you call my home ask for mr. Watson Watson w8 eson he said also after I returned if you ever need to call me at my office he gave a number the office number and he said simply leave word that mr. Watson is calling so it was a name that both of us were to use my name and his name I did not contact him during the next 30 days and I next heard from him to the best of my recollection sometime in September 1972 on a Sunday afternoon I keep recalled the exact date but I do recall that mr. Clark McGregor then the head of the committee for the real X in the President had just finished a

[00:26:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=1561s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=1561s)

the President had just finished a television appearance on one of the talk problems such as Meet the Press and mr. Caulfield called me at home and again asked that I go to the telephone booth on route 355 which I did he stated that he had trouble getting my home phone number because it was an unlisted number and he stated quote we are worried about you this is mr. Caulfield statement and he went on then to read briefly the words of a deposition which he planned to give to the Democratic National Committee I had read in the papers a few days before that he had been scheduled as a witness before the Democratic National Committee and he read the deposition to me indicating that this was in effect what he planned to say in the deposition there was some reference during the conversation to something going with a double agent in quotes mr. Clark MacGregor as I recalled in his television appearance had referred to the possibility of there being a double agent in the Watergate operation and the inference was that it was mr. ballin and I told mr. Caulfield that so far as I was concerned whoever had drawn that conclusion had drawn an absolutely erroneous conclusion that I had seen absolutely nothing that would indicate such and I simply wanted to go on the record with mr. Caulfield to that effect we do want to get back to the statement but in short what you're saying is that mr. Caulfield's friend Watts by name is the man whose voice you heard that no sir that's and most respectfully that's not what I said sir

[00:28:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=1681s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=1681s)

respectfully that's not what I said sir broad I believe mr. Caulfield used the name Watson it was not his friend yes your honor well how many times did you hear this I unidentified voice the best of my recollection I heard they heard the voice prior to the January call two or three times I cannot be absolutely sure but at least twice before January well these in connection with contacts with coffee always yes that's what I meant yes thank you statement from where you've left office record I guess the prior sentence that we don't have a continuity I believe my last sentence that I read was a the same message was once again repeated obviously read w that appears in the statement that you have on page three the next sentence was that I told the caller that I would not discuss such matters over the telephone and he stated that mr. Caulfield was out of town on Wednesday January 10th 1973 the same party to the best of my recollection called and told me by phone that Jack would want to talk with me by phone on Thursday night the following night January 11th when he got back into town and requested that I go to the same phone booth on route 355 near the blue fountain inn he also conveyed instructions regarding a personal meeting with mr. Caulfield on Friday night January 12th on Thursday evening January 11th the same party called me at home and told me that

[00:30:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=1801s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=1801s)

called me at home and told me that Caulfield's plane was late and wanted and that he speaking of Caulfield wanted to meet with me personally the same evening that is Thursday evening after arrival I told him that I would not do so but would meet with him on Friday night if he desired later that evening the same evening Thursday evening about 9:30 p.m. coffee will call me on my home phone and insisted on talking with me but my family refused to let him do so since I was asleep on Friday night January 12 from about 7:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. I met with Caulfield at the second / that is overlooking that Potomac it's a parking area or looking the Potomac River on George Washington Parkway in Virginia Court how did that meeting be arranged how did you know that go there it was as previously stated I believe on the Wednesday call to the best of my recollection in which this unidentified party had said that Caulfield will want to meet with you personally and he said on Friday night go to the second overlook on George Washington Parkway and he specified a time and that is what I followed through with I met with Caulfield at the second overlook on George Washington Parkway that is the second one leaving Washington going out in Virginia and talked with him in his car in his automobile Caulfield advised that he had been attending a law enforcement meeting in San Clemente California and had just returned I advised him that I had no objection to meeting with him to tell him my frame of mind but that I had no intention of talking executive clemency are pleading

[00:32:02 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=1922s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=1922s)

talking executive clemency are pleading guilty that I had come to the meeting at his request and not of my own and I was glad to tell him my views he said that the offer of executive clemency which he was passing along and of support while in prison and rehabilitation and help towards toward a job later quote was a sincere offer unquote he explained that he had been asked to convey this message to me and he was only doing what he was told to do he repeated this last statement several times during the course of the meeting that we had then and I might add during subsequent meetings which he and I had my response was that I would not even discuss executive clemency are pleading guilty and remaining silent but I was glad to talk with him so that there was no misunderstanding on anyone's part about it I might explained that the trial was going on during this period this was the first week of the trial which began on January 8th Caulfield stated that he was carrying the message of executive clemency to me quote from the very highest levels of the White House unquote he stated that the President of the United States was in Key Biscayne Florida that weekend referring to the weekend following January 8th following the meeting that we were then in that the president had been told of the forthcoming meeting with me and would be immediately told of the results of the meeting previous meeting previously announced

[00:34:02 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=2042s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=2042s)

previous meeting previously announced this this evidence is competent to show what if anything John coffee feel did to induce mr. McCord to plead guilty and keep silent it is not any evidence in his present state of the hearing that connects in it makes any connection whatever has any relevancy as to the president precisely yes sir he further stated that quote I may have a message to you at our next meeting from the President himself unquote I advised Caulfield that I had seen the list of witnesses for the trial and had seen Jeb McGruder's name appearing as a government witness I advised him that it was clear then that Magruder was going to perjure himself and that we were not going to get a fair trial further I told him that it was clear that some of those involved in the Watergate case were going to trial and others were going to be covered for parenthesis I was referring to John Mitchell John Dean and Magruder Francis closed and I so named those individuals incidentally during the conversation and I said that this was not my idea of American justice I further guys in the same room as wise as far as John Mitchell John Dean and the booth is concerned that is it does not connect them legally speaking yes I further advised Caulfield yes I further advised Caulfield that I believed that the government had lied in denying electronic interception of my phone calls from my residence since June

[00:36:02 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=2162s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=2162s)

phone calls from my residence since June 19 June 17 1972 and that I believe that the administration had also tapped the phones of the other defendants during that time I mentioned two specific calls of mine which I had made during September and early October 1972 which I was certain had been intercepted by the government and yet the government had blithely denied any such tapping these were my words to mr. Caulfield I compared this denial to the denial the government had made in the Ellsberg case in which for months the government had denied any such impermissible intersection of calls and yet in the summer of 1972 had finally been forced to admit them when a judge ordered by court order a search of about a dozen government agencies and calls intercepted were then disclosed on that state separate from the record at this point that as I have previously stated I had no knowledge whatever of any activity monitoring or what-have-you of mr. Ellsberg calls as have previously come out as have earlier come out in the newspapers in the past few days it's purely coincidence that I happen to mention the Ellsberg case at that time I had been following the case in the papers and I knew the history of the case to go on with a statement I stated that if we were going to get a fiction of a fair trial through perjured testimony to begin with and then for the government to lie about illegal telephone interceptions at the trial ought to be kicked out we start all over again this time with all of those involved as defendants at least in this way quote some would not be more equal than others unquote before the bar of justice and we get a fair trial the executive clemency offer was made two or three times during this meeting as I recall and I repeated

[00:38:02 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=2282s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=2282s)

this meeting as I recall and I repeated each time that I would not even discuss it in our discuss pleading guilty which I had been asked to do in the first telephone call received on the night of January 8th from Caulfield's friend whose identity I do not know I told him referring to mr. Caulfield that I was going to renew the motion upon disclosure of government wiretapping of our telephones Caulfield ended the conversation by stating that he would call me the next day about a meeting that same afternoon Saturday January 13 and that if I did not hear from him he would want to talk with me by telephone on the evening of Monday January 15 1973 I did not hear from Caulfield on Saturday but on Sunday afternoon he called and asked to meet me that afternoon about an hour later at the same location on George Washington Parkway he stated that there was no objection to renewing the motion on discovery of government wiretapping and if that failed that I would receive executive clemency after 10 to 11 months I told him that I had not asked anyone's permission to file the motion he went on to say that quote the president's ability to govern is at stake another Teapot Dome scandal is possible and the government may fall everybody else is on track but you you are not following the gameplan get closer to your attorney you seem to be pursuing your own course of action don't talk if caller before the grand jury keep silent and do the same if

[00:40:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=2401s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=2401s)

jury keep silent and do the same if called before a congressional committee on court I might add that two congressional committees had prior to January 9th prior to that date meant conducting investigations into this case I believe it was a Patman committee in the mystic Senator Kennedy's Senator Pat limb Senator Kennedy's committees paragraph my response was that I felt paragraph my response was that I felt a massive injustice was being done that I was different from the others that I was going to fight the fix case and I had no intention of either pleading guilty taking executive clemency are agreeing to remain silent he repeated the statement that the government would have difficulty in continuing to be able to stand I responded that they do have a problem but that I had a problem with the massive injustice of the whole trial being a sham and that I would fight it everywhere no I should make the correction and the Sunnis that I've just read when I saved the whole trial being a sham because I did not at that point in time making a reference at any time to judge Sarika I made just the contrary of his being anything but an honest and a dedicated judge and I don't want the Sunnis to be misread he asked for it he talking about Caulfield asked for a commitment that I would remain silent and I responded like then I gave him a memorandum on the dates of the two golf calls a lion in September 1972 in October 1972 that I was sure have been intercepted and said that I believe the government had lied about them he said that he would check and see if in fact the government had done so on Monday night January 15th 1973 Caulfield called me again at the phone booth on route 355 near my

[00:42:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=2521s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=2521s)

phone booth on route 355 near my residence I informed him that I had no desire to talk further that if the White House had any intention of playing the game straight and giving us a semblance of a fair trial they would check into the perjury charge of mine against Magruder's Magruder and into the existence of the two intercepted calls previously referred to and I hung up on Tuesday morning the next morning about 7:30 mr. Caulfield called my residence but had already left for court on Tuesday evening Caulfield called and asked me again to meet with him and I responded not until after they had something to talk about on the perjured testimony and the intercepted calls he said where's the effect give us a week and a meeting was subsequently raised On January 25 1973 what he said he would have something to talk about about 10:00 a.m. on Thursday January 25 1973 in a meeting lasting until about 12:30 a.m. the correction 12:30 p.m. we drove in his car toward Warrenton Virginia and returned that is we drove there in return and a conversation ensued which repeated the offers of executive clemency and financial support while in prison and rehabilitation later I refused to discuss it he stated that I was quote fouling up the gameplan unquote and I made a few comments about the game plan he stated that quote they unquote had found no record of the interception of the two calls I referred to and said that perhaps it can wait until the appeals he asked what my plans were regarding talking publicly and I said that I planned to do so when I was ready that I had discussed it with my wife and she said that I should do what I felt I must and not to worry about the family I advised Jack that my children were now

[00:44:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=2641s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=2641s)

advised Jack that my children were now grown and could understand what I had to do when the disclosures came out he responded by saying quote you know that if the administration gets its back to the wall it will have to take steps to defend itself and of course I took that as a personal threat I told him the response I'd had a good life and the will was laid out and I had thought through the wrists would take him when I was ready he said that if I had to go off to jail that the administration would help with the bail premiums I advised him it was not a bail premium but a hundred thousand dollars straight cash if that was a problem I would have to worry about through family and friends on the night before sentencing Jack called me and said that the administration would provide the hundred thousand in cash if I could tell him how to get it funded through an intermediary I said if we ever needed it and I would let him know I never contacted him thereafter neither have I heard from him and that completes the statement I went to one more questions report have you ever made that statement before before this Select Committee other than when you appeared before minority counsel and myself a couple of days ago but have you ever made that statement before this committee before the grand jury or before any investigating body until this time no sir could you

please state to the committee why when you were making statements in earlier time before this committee before the grand jury and other enquiring bodies you fail to disclose that information I'll be glad to take the grand jury and get that one out of the way when I appeared before the grand jury I told them that they inquired about political pressure I raised the pressure that had been put to me by the Hunts and told them as well

[00:46:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=2760s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=2760s)

me by the Hunts and told them as well that there was a personal friend who was involved also in political pressure against me that personally at that point in time it was very painful thing to go into it that I would be glad to do it at a later time and I hope they would defer that question until subsequent to questioning and I would be glad to answer it they said they would do so I believe when I appeared before the executive committee here on March 28th that your Senators asked me the same question and I said yes there had been political pressure applied to me that one such pressure had been by a government one of your senators asked me if it were my I'm an employee I think senator Montoya and I responded yes and he asked if it were anyone with the white house and I said no he asked if it were from the Department of Justice and I said no it was clear I think to the committee that I would like to be able to answer that question later time the reason for the delay is that I wanted to be as accurate as I could about the information and get it all together because it involved the President of the United States in my opinion and it was a very serious matter no one to be very careful about it and accurate I have no further questions mr. chairman mr. McCord I'd like to limit my questions to one area and that's what you know about the planning of the Watergate break-in first of all I'd like to separate what mr. hunt told you someone said about it from what mr. Liddy told you someone said about it mr. hunt indicate to you that he knew anything about these meetings that Mister later referred to with Mitchell Magruder indeed your question is did mr. hunt just indicate that he knew anything about the meeting yes sir yes he did what did he say about those meetings did

[00:48:03 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=2883s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=2883s)

what did he say about those meetings did he indicate that he was present in any of those meetings I'm trying to recall exactly the context of the discussions if I may go into that a little yes sir the meetings as best I recall which these references by Mr Hunt took place took place in mr. hunts office in the robert f Mullen company offices at 1,700 Pennsylvania Avenue they took place in April and May of 1972 to the best of my recollection mr. Liddy was present in all of the discussions mr. Liddy during those discussions as best I recall would raise the topic of the planning and the progress of the operation itself it's going forward and comments about mr. Mitchell was saying to him about what should be done in terms of the priorities of the operation that is which ones would be done first and second and mr. hunts comments his exact words I can't recall but his comments made to me and not to me made in the three-way discussion that we're taking place during that period of time indicated to me that he had separate independent knowledge perhaps from mr. Liddy perhaps from other sources of his own that mr. Mitchell and mr. Dean and mr. Magruder had planned the operations in the attorney general's office to begin with and that at least mr. Mitchell and mr. Magruder had had subsequent discussions after the first meeting in the attorney general's office and that mr. Magruder and mr. Mitchell had had discussions with mr. Liddy and

[00:50:03 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=3003s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=3003s)

had had discussions with mr. Liddy and mr. Mitchell's offices at the committee to re-elect the president regarding the ongoing plans to carry out the operations does this answer your question well I think it naturally raises several other questions what did he say as best you can recall to indicate to you that he had any independent knowledge other than what mr. Liddy might have told him I think he would refer to comments to Gordon as though as you and I have discussed before that would not fall in that category then it would fall in that category as things that mr. Hahn had learned separate and apart from what mr. Liddy atole it would fall in the category I said two things I said one what mr. Liddy had told him before and secondly what it appeared to me he had learned from and I've mentioned to this committee a name of another individual but I will not

raise it at this point that mr. Hutton referred to in conversations in which we were talking about the Watergate operations and the planning for the operations it's on the statement place and I should refer to it the name previously referred to the name of mr. Colson that was interjected into the conversation by Mr Hunt in the meetings with mr. Liddy and mr. hunt and me in his offices Hut's offices at 1700 Pennsylvania Avenue and specifically when Mr Hunt had a plan and typed plan operational plan for the entry of the Democratic National Committee headquarters thank you do you recall anything that mr. hunt said to you about mr. Coulson's environment or did you just get the general impression that mr. Colson was involved in some way from what mr. Hart told you I believe my previous testimony which I will restate before this committee was to the effect that when I

[00:52:02 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=3122s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=3122s)

committee was to the effect that when I had met Mr Hunt in his offices at 1,700 Pennsylvania Avenue with mr. Liddy that he had referred to his previous work at the White House for mr. Colson referring to him as his superior that during the sessions that mr. hunt mr. Liddy and I had in mr. hunts offices Mr Hunt had a typed plan that he had typed himself step-by-step for the history of the Democratic National Committee headquarters that at one point he held this plan in his hands and his words were he interjected the name of mr. Colson into the conversation at that point words to the effect I will see Colson and he held the paper in his hand in this sense and from that statement I drew the conclusion that he was going to see mr. Colson and discuss our giving the operational plan that near the conclusion but this is also the words as best I recall in which mr. hunt raised the name of mr. Colson I'm sure that will need to be pursued but getting back to my original point is that independent knowledge that Mr Hunt had of these meetings that were referring to he did not bring mr. Colson into the conversation with regard to these particular meetings that you previously referred to hitti I believe he was he appeared to have knowledge I said that he appeared to have knowledge of the previous meetings of the Attorney General in the attorney general's offices of mr. Linney mr. Magruder and mr. Dean my response was to the effect that he headed from mr. Liddy from what he told me believe also that he had I believed also that he had this information from others well I don't want to believe at the point and

[00:54:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=3240s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=3240s)

don't want to believe at the point and I'm certainly not trying to you've been you know doesn't matter of fact you say that you think he had independent knowledge and of course this is a serious matter we I think we have to determine whether or not we're relying on mr. Liddy or Mr Hunt and mr. lady for this information which is course extremely important information and anything that you can state that mr. hunt told you to indicate that he had any independent knowledge of these meetings I think would be very relevant that what you can do it now or it's applied several memoranda but very helpful in that regard you want to do that at a subsequent time I think that would be approving that pot told you indicating he knew about these meetings independent of what Liddy told him now let's get back to the meetings and a little bit more detail mr. Ford how many meetings that did mister ladies say there were when when when when the when the overall surveillance operations were discussed well how many meetings overall up until June 17th did mr. Liddy indicate that he Mitchell Magruder and Dean or any combination of these people had to discuss general it was stated to me embarrassing summary meetings with mr. Liddy between January and June 17th by misleading that he had had several meetings with mr. Mitchell that they appeared to be ongoing meetings with mr. Mitchell from the planning stage until the completion of the plans for the second entry operation on June 17th that there appeared to be continuous

[00:56:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=3360s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=3360s)

there appeared to be continuous discussions between at least mr. Liddy and mr. Mitchell and sometimes with mr. Bueller according to statements which mr. Liddy made to me and they they began with the planning and they continued through the ongoing operation itself and the monitoring and the planning for the second operation and discussions at various stages according to mr. Liddy of the various priorities of the bugging

and photography operations what was to come first partners to come second mr. Liddy come to you after each important meeting were after each meeting where these matters were discussed and give you a summary of the meeting and what was discussed and what the conclusions were not after each meeting at all but we would see each other regularly during the week I'd say if not once a day at least every other day most weeks between January and June 17th sometimes he would tell me I'm getting ready to go up to see the Attorney General to discuss this operation referring to the Watergate operation to discuss the operation he had planned sometimes he would tell me I've just come back from that operation and here's what we're going to do now some of these some of these meetings according to him according to what he told you while mr. Mitchell was still Attorney General yes if some after he came to the committee really yes where money figure discussed most important what he said what was the report of mr. Lilley what was the original proposed budget for therefore the overall surveillance operation I assume we are talking about the overall operation of not just the Watergate break-in is that correct talking about three categories like westernized photography operations and the electronic operations and the original figure in February that mr. Liddy proposed as I saw in writing in a draft on his desk at one occasion and in a

[00:58:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=3481s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=3481s)

on his desk at one occasion and in a typed memorandum on a second occasion with approximately 450,000 dollars all right was according to him was that budget approved the sequence of the events were that there were planning meetings in January or February are both in the attorney general's offices in which mr. Deane and mr. Magruder mr. Liddy and mr. Mitchell discussed the original amount four hundred and fifty thousand dollar amount and subsequently approximately 30 days after the first formal meeting that I heard referred to but mr. there was a figure of approximately 250,000 dollars which he said had been approved for the operation and he referred also to some additional funds which he had in the order of approximately a hundred thousand dollars so that figure is not absolutely certain in my mind which would total about something around three hundred thousand dollars three hundred fifty thousand dollars according to him was was this was this money problem the the need for subsequent meetings was that a concern of the people involved whether it was there quite a bit of discussion as to exactly how much money should be spent on this project money was a topic that he said was discussed he said the individual operations were discussed that is specifically the three parts of his budget which he had prepared on charts which he had taken to at least one of the meetings that is the three parts of political espionage and photography and so on it was not limited the discussion was not limited to the matter of funding my understanding was

[01:00:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=3601s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=3601s)

matter of funding my understanding was all aspects of the operations were discussed in those meetings by the for individual let me just ask you this did he tell you that John that John Michell ever told him that this budget is just too high and you'll have to do it for less or something so no I understand did he ever tell you that they specifically discussed the Watergate operation if any of these meetings which meetings are your Frankton thought about any meetings which he had with the Attorney General when any of these other people were present plans with the Watergate break-in specifically was discussed very deftly what did he say about that particular discussion it was a continuous discussion he said with mr. Magruder from the earliest planning session in February through the first entry operation Memorial Day weekend and then into the second operation in June and he talked to me at various times and it was clear from what he said that clear to me that mr. Liddy was having such meetings he stated that he was having such meetings in which the Watergate operation was apart Watergate referring to the Democratic National Committee headquarters itself so I would say there are many such discussions by mr. Liddy with me in which he stated that meetings that occurred with mr. Mitchell and Magruder specifically on this after February I think that one of the areas that has not been covered is the role of the person who was on the other side of the wiretap which you installed in May the end of May 1972 now did you employ mr. Baldwin is there Alfred Baldwin for that purpose yesterday and what was his particular assignment with regard to monitoring the

[01:02:03 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=3723s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=3723s)

assignment with regard to monitoring the wiretap his assignment was to listen on a radio receiver that received the transmissions from the Democratic National Committee telephones in which the electronic devices have been installed in connect with the two dates of Memorial Day weekend on June 17th 1972 where was he located when he was doing this monitoring on the seventh floor of the Howard Johnson motel across the street from the Democratic National Committee headquarters now mr. court can you see the chart National Committee headquarters now mr. McCourt can you see the chart on the easel there yes now the picture purports to show the Howard Johnsons on your right and Watergate office building on your left does it represent the room 723 which was used by mr. Baldwin's of monitoring steps and he was in just right across the street and knowing that in his monitoring how was he recording what he was hearing he would listen with headphones to the conversations that were being transmitted and would take down the substance of the conversations the time the date on the yellow legal side scratchpad and then ultimately would type them up a summary of them by time chronological summary and turned that type log in to me and I would deliver them to mr. Liddy did you deliver him to mr. Liddy directly yes now yes now did there come a time when

[01:04:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=3840s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=3840s)

now yes now did there come a time when you were delivering those logs that they were retaining I know at least one instance in which that was that occurred because I saw them being retyped was it your understanding that that occurred on more than one occasion even though you yourself yes what was the purpose of retyping the log of mr. Liddy explain that to you I believe some general explanation in substance said he wanted them in a more final complete form for discussion with mr. Mitchell or and whoever else received them now who who did this retyping Sally harmony har emmalin-- why who is the Secretariat to the stability at the committee for the re-election of the President and did you have occasion to observe her typing the log yesterday the dedication to talk to her while she was doing yesterday and in that conversation you have a Sally harmony did you get did she give you any indication that she understood what she was doing when she was three typing that lot yes she did as a matter of fact could you briefly describe it are going into any of the contents what a what a log would be what actually would be entered would on the log which mr. Baldwin would first type and be read site by mrs. harmony it would be similar to any other telephone conversation that one person might make to another beginning with a statement on his log of the time of the call who was calling whom a summary of what was said during the conversation itself including names of persons who were mentioned at the tamal and apparently believe you was a significant sufficient significance to

[01:06:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=3961s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=3961s)

significant sufficient significance to set forth on the law then it would be true that anybody reading that would have no difficulty knowing it came from a telephone conversation that's correct now I think you testified earlier and I just wanted to get it clear for the record that your discussions with mr. Liddy concerning meetings he had with the Attorney General indicated that mr. Liddy was actually meeting with the Attorney General with regard to this operation that's all the way up to what time what was the last date that mr. Liddy indicated that he had a meeting with the Attorney General regarding this particular bugging operation my best recollection is immediately before June 17th during I would I would estimate during that week immediately preceding June 17th did mr. Liddy indicate what the nature of that meeting was all I can recall at this point is some substance of some conversation as a general conversation to the fact that where we discussed getting ready for the operation that's coming up and I think just just the overall planning for the operation when you when you got going back very briefly to the information that you were getting from the Internal Security Division was was your trip to Miami related in any way to the Department of Justice's investigation of the event of veterans for the Against the War Vietnam no was your any of the investigation that you engaged in with regard to that group

[01:08:02 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=4082s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=4082s)

engaged in with regard to that group related to the Department of Justice investigation in in Miami give me more any other place I'm sorry would you mind restating that question I'm not sure I quite I think in your testimony you indicated that information you were receiving from the Internal Security Division and other information related in some respects to activities of the Veterans Against the War Vietnam yes was your activity and we're getting that information or any investigation you were conducting on behalf of the committee related in any way to the any investigation that the partner Justice was making with the same group if by that it's meant that whatever information I was acquiring separate and apart from the Internal Security Division was being transmitted back them to them the answer would be no it was a one-way street it was at that time now the youth names in the that time now the youth named in the second break-in of the Watergate four persons in addition to the involvement mr. Liddy in HoN and you name is de Barker mr. Martinez mr. Sturgis mr. Gonzalez I think you also mentioned that in the first break-in there were three additional persons could you name them for the record please I don't know that I know the names for certain I have been shown some photographs by the FBI if you want me to relate that you do not know the names of your own not have you identified photographs of persons who did accompany you in the first I've seen two

[01:10:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=4200s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=4200s)

you in the first I've seen two photographs of men that I believe we're in that first operation as a result of that identification that you then learn what their names were I heard the names the names that I recent what I'm trying to say as the names I recently heard were apparently not the true names so I can't associate the two together that way but the photographs when one individual was I believe that I made a probable identification officer mr. Felipe D Diego and the other name associated with the photograph that identified was a mr. Renaldo RTI an Ald old picot P ICO now mr. McCord I've had placed at your table a telephone which is not connected to anything and what I would like you to do because you testified with regard to a particular bugging operation of Democratic National Committee headquarters if you would demonstrate to the committee the manner in which you placed the so-called bug in the telephone and what I plead like to ask the the custody of the receiver to please take the receiver over to the table my my council asked for assurance that I won't be prosecuted on this installation as I said the telephone is connected is not connected and no conversations being

[01:12:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=4320s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=4320s)

not connected and no conversations being involved now I also will now I also will show you a item which is was entered as an exhibit as six seven sixteen B at the trial and I understand was taken from either your possession or in the vicinity of where you were when you were arrested and I think is a miniature transmitter a microphone and ask if you would identify that yes I believe this is the one entered into evidence yes now will you identify exactly what that is this is a radio essentially a radio transmitter which is powered by the power within the telephone system the telephone line itself and this transmitter is connect was connected or was for the purpose of being connected into the telephone itself the purpose of transmitting those conversations over the phone when that when that transmitter is connected in the telephone is it capable of picking up both sides of the conversation and broadcasting it to another place yes it is could you just demonstrate not not actually attaching it how you would place that in that telephone that's before you the cover would be taken off of the telephone when you lift the base a little so that the Senate committee can see what you're doing cover would be taken off of the telephone I have no further questions first for this day who made arrangements

[01:14:02 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=4442s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=4442s)

first for this day who made arrangements for you to receive as you say on virtual daily basis documents from the Internal Security Division partner justice mr. Robert mardian made the contact with as I understood it with the Internal Security Division where he had formerly worked now he he at that time he made the contact he was working for the committee to re-elect the president having retired from his Justice Department job yes sir he had been the head of that particular division of the Department of Justice or he transferred to the

committee so I understood just now much Mr. Caulfield came to see you rather was when he met you on three occasions that took you out to twice to George Washington Parkway and one time towards Warrenton Virginia was he driving his own automobile or government automation Toby I believe he was driving them his own automobile insurance yes Mr. Court I know you've been here a long time and I appreciate that fact I do have a couple of rather pointed questions I'd like to ask you I don't fancy myself in the role as a prosecutor or a defense lawyer but I feel like there are a couple of things that I need to ask you about questions are going begging and I plan to do so in that spirit and I'm sure you understand Mr. McCord there was some testimony some previous testimony concerning the use of tapes the use of tape on the locks of the doors at the Democratic National Committee and you testified in response I believe last Friday in response to a question from Senator Baker who placed

[01:16:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=4560s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=4560s)

question from Senator Baker who placed the tape on the locks on the door on the second occasion and he responded I do not know the second occasion being the June 17 break-in as opposed to the first occasion when I believe you said was May 27 according to civil deposition which you gave on April 30 1973 suit brought by the Democratic National Committee against you and others and page 167 of that deposition your testimony is related as follows the reason for checking it first of all on the way over I checked the back door of a DNC or the Watergate Hotel office building basement level the reason for checking it is that at the earlier meeting earlier that he didn't evening it had been decided that I would be elected to go into the DNC and take the doors so there could be ready access for them to get in and the man with the locksmith wouldn't have to pick a series of door to get in I did that it took perhaps ten minutes could you explain that discrepancy sure because I believe your question was stated who taped the monthly lock on the second occasion that they were taped at least I understood the question that way on June 17th they were taped on two different occasions and my response if it was not clear was intended to convey this idea that I taped it on the first occasion that they were taped on the evening of June 17th and that someone else did the second taping that evening perhaps an hour so later among the other four men the other four defendants just which one did so I don't know that's what I was trying to convey I see how many doors were taped the second time I think there were several because there are several doors that normally would be perhaps a

[01:18:02 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=4682s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=4682s)

doors that normally would be perhaps a half a dozen or more there's about three down on the lower level and then there's some doors up entering the carters from perhaps fourth fifth sixth seventh floors that I would leave or tape that evening I don't know about the corridors they were not removed when I saw them on the lower level of course there would be no need to retake them had not state been removed was it see if I understand your question there'd be no reason to retake them to take the doors a second time if the first tape had not been removed no that's correct you heard officer Schaffer I believe Miss McCord to testify last week that the when the doors were locked there at the DNC that one could get out of an office building without a key without having the door taped could you explain first of all what was the need to tape the doors once you were inside and secondly why did no one seemingly have the presence of mind to remove the tape on the b2 level and leave it there for the officer client well I think you almost have to see the different doors involved to be able to understand that situation and it involves this there are there are some stairwells coming down off of different floors and even stairwells I believe off of the same floor say on the six or seven that call down like a rule that is you may go on into the stairwell off of the Carter from one exit and it'll go down one

[01:20:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=4800s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=4800s)

from one exit and it'll go down one stair well they go around the corner and you go down to another one it'll go down a separate stairwell to flying down some of those doors are at night locked from both sides as I recall so that some are not but let me correct that summer lock from the inside they were locked so that if you were trying to get out of the corridor down into a stairwell late at night you couldn't get in to the stairwell but you might be able to go up a couple of floors say to the 8th floor and I think there was a door open there and

you would have to come and then go in to say you want to get back down at the 6th floor and go into the car go into that door from the stairwell side you could get in so that daughter for example would have to be taped if you had in mind getting out in a hurry and getting down it had to be taped from me you have to go into it in the stairwell side first some these other doors walk from both sides I believe you're right right I believe you're right you'd almost have to be there to understand you would it's pretty complex is this the reason the 8th floor door was was taped on this case so did you personally check out the doors check the situation to determine whether or not tape would be needed on on particular doors before you went in to take those doors or did anyone check it out well we knew from the previous operation on Memorial Day that they would have to be taped if you're going to plan to leave in a hurry if you got caught there for example that's a police came in on you before you got in you'd have to tape the doors or otherwise you couldn't be sure that you could get out what about the answer to the second part of my question here you are with what you you were an experienced man and CIA and FBI and evidently these other men were experienced in their own way and yet the tape to the b2 level readily

[01:22:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=4921s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=4921s)

yet the tape to the b2 level readily accessible to anyone coming by there to check as the officer did was left on the door you didn't you didn't remove the tape why was that done and secondly why was the risk taken to go back up into the dnc with no means of escape evidently once you were caught after you had seen that someone had removed the tape and for all practical purposes you had to assume that someone was aware that somebody was trying to get in or had already gotten you why was that decision made to start with why was decision made to go back in there after you knew someone knew that you'd been tampered with that door all right so good question because we we had a lot of discussion later we we're in jail we came by the lower level door than originally been taped assuming that it was the tape was still there and we could get right on in without any delay this is all of the five men together getting ready to go up into the Democratic National Committee headquarters and we found that that tape had been taken off and that the door was now locked speaking in the basement level so we regrouped so to speak right below the restaurant in the Watergate Hotel and talked over what to do and it was agreed that the locksmith and I believe one or two of the men would go back over and make an effort to pick the lock to get in and that was that decision reached well after you knew that someone had detected your being there for you all right let me we had the decision was just to send the locksmith back over and let him start to work in order that there not be any more delay in time and for the other demand

[01:24:02 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=5042s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=5042s)

delay in time and for the other demand Barker and I believed one other to go back up to Mr Hunt room and discuss the situation with mr. Liddy in terms of what do they feel we should do next should the option should they go ahead and pick them to try to pick the lock and get on the inner shouldn't be called off and for me to go back over to motel waiting for word on what was to be done understood well understood that this was a calculated risk and sending them back over to begin picking the mark but on the other hand the more time that went by the fewer people there would be around the Watergate Hotel and the more conspicuous and then would be therefore that had some risk in terms of delaying the matter any further sort of so I sort of decided to go both directions to go ahead and start to get in go back up and talk it over with him see what they want to do who made the ultimate decision - as to whether Knights were going back in that night you say that you say that there were risk in waiting you mean what waiting in it later that night or waiting until another day or another week or what well there were risks in waiting any longer that night for example wine I'd call the whole thing off and come back in two three nights well it looks like pretty good idea now I guess it doesn't very good it was it was made on the basis that first of all as I say any further delay in time made five men stand out that much more that night blend time at night mediate five men stand out that much more around the hotel and around the Watergate office building therefore rather than lose that time the decision was to go both directions to go ahead and send the locksmith back or let him start to work on it and let the other two men go up and talk it over was ready or not and see what they wanted to do did they want to proceed or not let me ask you a question about regard to another subject

[01:26:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=5161s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=5161s)

question about regard to another subject as I understand your testimony is man that I believe on July 27 of 1972 he received her first payment from Mrs. Hunt only \$15,000 and that was - do you through November I believe that you received from some additional money in December which was to be payment in advance the rest of December and January yes we called do you recall the date of a payment in December I believe it was a second of December December the second you mentioned the letter that you wrote to Mr. Caulfield the anonymous letter in in December do you recall the date and the summer better no I can only remember the week which was a week following Christmas December 25th very hard to be someone yes so your letter in Mr. Caulfield was after you'd receive the diva these number two payment yes and what was that payment how much money was it was far the to two months payment for the salary for December and for I think additional money fifteen thousand dollars please was there some question in the latter part of November or during December as to whether or not additional money would be forthcoming yes it was question on Hunt's part and Mrs. Hunt communicated that question to me I think that probably had something to do with the letter that he wrote that I've described a three-page letter that was read didn't have anything to do with your letter that you wrote the Caulfield none whatever my letter had to do was my anger about this plan to lay this operation on CIA and I think the letter

[01:28:04 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=5284s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=5284s)

operation on CIA and I think the letter sort of indicates that Miss McCord you you have stated that you were concerned from sometimes shortly before the trial I believe up until recently that the trial was a sham that the trial was fixed that was a miscarriage of justice and I assume that you're talking about essentially the fact that some of the right people were not being prosecuted and and you were not being treated right with regard to full disclosure by the government is that it was that essentially correct I think I can state it more precisely it was the fact that there was perjured testimony in the trial itself by a key witness that key witness was Mr. Jebin Magruder his testimony was the whole trial pardon me just a minute the basis on which you say his testimony was perjured was perjury I assume has to do with what Mr. Liddy has told you about Mr. Bruton McGruder is that not correct told me before June 17th and the comments we exchanged at the time Mr. Liddy excuse me Mr. Magruder was up on the stand stating that he knew nothing about the Watergate operation prior to June 17th so the answer to my question is yes no not completely there is also a factor that Mr. Magruder in addition to testifying that he knew nothing about the Watergate operation and his testimony being probably that of the most important witness in the trial also could have named others who were principals in the case specifically Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Deane according the information I had from Mr. Liddy in which I had no doubt that you could have

[01:30:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=5400s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=5400s)

which I had no doubt that you could have to couldn't you I could have done right why didn't you I'm glad to talk that one over to why didn't I get on the stand yes it seems to me again if we're not preface a little bit according to the statement of your attorneys there at the time Mr. all your defense was that essentially as you stated to Senator Baker here today that you felt like that because the violence in the country and so forth it actually to pose the threat possibly your life and the lives of other people that's in the record Gordon oh sure I take it your defense was not that at that time part of your motivation was not as you have stated here before this committee that you thought you had had the right posture go ahead without being in legal difficulty because which was involvement because Mr. Dean's involvement that's part of what you've told us but evidently you didn't tell Mr. Ofsted Mr. Alex didn't use that as part of your defense I'm wondering about the answer to those questions why didn't you come forward at that time and why didn't you tell Mr. Ulchhhh what could have been an even more significant part of your defense at that time well I've had many conversations with Mr. Alt about the facts of the case and the other principles involved the decision of mind as to when to come forward with the information which I did was basically my decision and it was a day at a time decision on my part as to when was the propitious time to tell the facts on this case she waited I waited until I had an opportunity to tell number one man I believed to be an honest judge Judge Sarika number two

to tell this committee so that there would be the proper forum for all of the facts to come out and to be discovered I felt for example during the trial itself that if I'd come forward and told the story at that point in time in light of the

[01:32:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=5521s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=5521s)

at that point in time in light of the nature of the information I had which some people have described as hearsay or secondhand the rules of evidence as I understand it may have excluded some of that information being provided in testimony or at least I felt that all of the facts would not be developed during the trial if I got up on the stand and related them to me it was a matter of when was the right time to tell it and this was a most difficult decision it was not influenced by money or anything else that was influenced by basically my own reasoning as to when was the right time to tell the story so that there would be an adequate forum for a development of all of the facts in the case and I think my decision has been the right one I think I told judge Sarika first and I told this the committee second and I'm fully convinced that that was the right decision was there any decision was there any doubt in your mind that if you'd come forward at that time to judge Sarika that he would not have taken the appropriate action and that the matter would not have been handled according to the trial transcript judge Sarika practically pleads with anyone to come forward and tell the truth he states here on page fourteen ninety nine of the trial transcript they know anything about this case they want to talk before the grand jury it's not too late that's up to them I mean I always operate under the theory that the truth never hurts anybody if they wait and they're convicted and then they decide to talk well I can't say anything about that but I think if they're going to talk if there's anything in their minds along those lines the time for him to do it is during the trial he was stating there and was there any doubt in your mind that you would be compromised in any way if you if you went forward and told Judge Sirica back in January not judge Sarika in the least he's sort of the lone man I felt I could depend on in this whole case he's also a man who will be sentencing you shortly that's a true - that's true - but what I'm saying about my belief in the man is honest and genuine but you ask my reasons and the reasons were the ones I've stated and I think the decision as

[01:34:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=5641s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=5641s)

I've stated and I think the decision as to the timing of saying what I did was was right and I don't regret that decision I believe as I've said if I'd done it earlier that quite frankly the facts would not have come out and been developed as they have and then develop this committee in the way that they have but you were of course receiving money during this period of time also weren't you I received money in the December 2nd floor when board journey or a second but that quite frankly had as I told the people who were sending it had no I was gonna say were you attempting with your conversations with mr. quality or did did the possibility that you could get your case may be thrown out of court because of the wiretap did that did that enter into your decision to hold out and not come forward weren't you trying at that time with mr. Caulfield to get him to get the government to admit illegal wiretap so that your case would be thrown yes now let me repeat what I've said before so it's as clear as I know how to make it said I thought the case was was a sham but the trial was because of the perjured testimony because of the withholding of highly material information by Jeb Magruder which would involve higher ups in the case number one and perjury number two which means that we were not getting a fair trial and I said this in many ways detect that I felt told we ought to not that really just as far as I was concerned the man that that the case be kicked out we start all over again on this thing and start all over in a circumstance that number one we'd get a fair trial we're not getting a fair trial if perjury is being committed thank you have you were interested in your fair trial which of course is your eyes for all that mr. McGruder his failure to in your eyes tell the truth about it did that prejudice your case absolutely if he is a key witness and all other testimony seems to fall into place around his testimony and he is

[01:36:01 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=5761s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=5761s)

around his testimony and he is withholding the names of principals in the case itself in other words a that prejudice is a case and it come it puts a completely totally different light on the case in other words the the trial itself was preparing to indicate that mr. Liddy was the sum total of this operation he was a leader the director under the whole package and that the case cut off at his level did not the case the case obviously extended much higher in other words mr. McGruder could have come in come in and implicated higher-ups so that you wouldn't have to is that the way in which his testimony prejudice your case and he can prove it that's that's the way you looked at looked at that because I assume there was no controversy over the fact that you were caught with four remain for the men huddled behind the desk with burglar tools on you and eavesdropping equipment no argument about that at all but I felt that under any circumstances at least man deserves a fair trial absolutely and if we were not getting absolutely you mentioned your calls in September knocked over to Chilean embassy and the Israeli embassy this of course was well let me ask you this what was the purpose of those particular phone calls I think I've previously stated if not uh we stated to try to test throat a test try to test the accuracy of the government's response regarding intercepted conversations of mine that was concerned that there had been wiretapping since June 17th of my telephone conversations and this would provide a test to see if in fact all the government records or the government some 12 agencies had in fact been searched the inferences by the response of the government 12 days 14 days after motions by all of us

[01:38:00 \(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=5880s\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2w9jJkMacw&t=5880s)

days after motions by all of us there is nothing and the government of any intersection of mr. Koretz calls anywhere and I knew that as I've stated it takes more than 14 days normally to search twelve different government agencies for records or such the telephone how was this a test mr. McCord did you think or did you know that these two MCS had been bugged I assumed that they were

END